

REMARKS

This Response responds to the Office Action dated July 13, 2005.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 because the term “said summary” lacked an antecedent. Independent claim 1, from which claim 6 depends, has been amended to provide an antecedent for this term.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Boyer et al., U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0066085 (hereinafter Boyer). Independent claim 1, as amended, includes the limitations of “extracting a datum related to a semantic event . . . describing a portion of said video” and “creating a summary of said identified portion of said video in response to the extraction of said datum.” The latter quoted limitation is not disclosed by Boyer, which prefabricates all summaries, i.e. video clips, interviews, etc. prior to a user extracting a datum related to a semantic event, i.e. still images of the prefabricated video clips, etc. In fact, the material the Examiner cited as being read upon by the limitation of “a datum related to a semantic event” are not disclosed to be created until after the summary is created. Therefore, independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 2-6, patentably distinguish over the cited reference. The applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6.

Similarly, independent claim 7 has been amended to include the limitation of “extracting said identified portions of said video from said video to form said video abstraction in response to the location of said index;” claim 11 has been amended to include the limitation of “extracting said content related to said semantic event from said video in response to extraction of said datum from said video for inclusion in said semantic summary including at least one portion of

Appl. No. 09/455,964  
Amdt. dated April 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2004

said video;” and claim 12 includes the limitation of “using said domain together with said index to identify portions of said video for inclusion in said video abstraction” and “extracting said identified portions of said video from said video to form said video abstraction.” The applicant notes that, with respect to claim 12, the Examiner’s assertion that Boyer discloses using display options of a video programming guide such as “by channel” or “by category” to extract, *from the video*, portions of the video to be displayed in the programming guide, is not possible as the portions of video ready to be displayed in the programming guide must be extracted and abstracted prior to a user accessing those abstractions by selecting display options.

Therefore, each of claims 7-12 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art, and the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner’s rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1-12.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlf  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631